

CALIFORNIA CHILDREN & FAMILIES COMMISSION

**February 14-15, 2002
New Otani Hotel
120 S. Los Angeles Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012**

Agenda Item 1 -- Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Reiner at 9:00 a.m.

Agenda Item 2 -- Roll Call

Present: Commissioners Kim Belshé, Elizabeth Rice-Grossman, Louis Vismara, Karen Hill-Scott, Sandra Gutierrez, and Chairman Reiner. Absent: Ex-officio members Theresa Garcia and Glen Rosselli.

Agenda Item 3 -- Approval of Minutes, January 17th, 2002 State Commission Meeting

The minutes from the January 17, 2002 Commission meeting were approved with the following corrections:

- Commissioner Grossman was not absent, as she had not yet been sworn in as a Commission member.
- The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. not 8:30 a.m.
- The discussion of the State Budget as proposed by the Governor for FY 2002-03 also included the Governor's proposal to eliminate the Child Development Policy Advisory Committee (CDPAC) effective January 2003.
- Commissioner Belshé, rather than Commissioner Vismara, made the motion to approve Item 10, the Child Development Permit Project.

Action by Commission: Chairman Reiner moved, seconded by Commissioner Gutierrez to approve the January 17th, 2002 minutes. The motion passed unanimously with the above corrections.

Agenda Item 4 – Appoint Commission Vice Chair

Commissioner Gutierrez nominated Commissioner Belshé as Vice Chair. Chairman Reiner seconded that nomination. Commissioner Vismara expressed support for the nomination of Commissioner Belshé.

Action by Commission: The motion to appoint Commissioner Belshé as the Vice Chair of the California Children and Families Commission passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 5 – County Children and Families Commission Policy Panel

- Elizabeth Lowe offered welcoming remarks to the Commission and introduced the panel. Ms. Lowe spoke briefly in support of preschool. She stated that she believes it is fundamental that all children should have quality preschool and suggested that there should be some sort of child development exposure.
- Neal Kaufman, Los Angeles CFC, spoke next. An outline follows.
 - Frequent interactions between the state and local commissions.
 - State activities well coordinated with the counties.
 - Incentivize projects.
 - Maximize the flexibility on how project goals are met.
 - Role of the State Commission at the local level.
 - Initiate projects
 - Provide statewide solutions
 - Workforce readiness
 - Universal preschool
 - Neighborhood revitalization
 - Improve the capacity of health care providers
 - Define a research agenda
 - Provide local solutions
 - Delivery of services
 - Creation of a data infrastructure
- Sandra McBrayer, San Diego CFC, spoke next. An outline follows.
 - Crucial questions to answer before any funding process.
 - What is the sustainability and the continued investment plan?
 - 3 to 10 year outlook.
 - What is the family support network surrounding this project? How can we support the family as a whole?
 - What do the counties believe are their regional issues?
 - What works? Why wait for evaluation?

- Is the infrastructure being put in place to continue a particular project?
- Crucial role of the State Commission
 - Advocacy

Ms. McBrayer stated that she has learned so much in Prop 10, but feels as though we have not used our power as county commissioners to stand up to the State and the Legislature. She concluded that the State and County Commissions must be a partnership and must be coordinated.

- Julie Bear, Inyo CFC, spoke next. An outline follows.
 - Items of special interest to rural counties
 - Internal capacity building
 - CBOs
 - Large geographical area
 - Only two hospitals
 - Community building

Ms. Bear concluded her presentation by stating her desire to continue to work with the State Commission.

- Kathy Long, Ventura County, spoke next. An outline follows.
 - Urban strategies
 - Neighborhoods for Learning (NFL)
 - Collaborative planning process
 - Identifying assets and needs
 - Designing an inclusive governance model that includes the parents as decision makers
 - Developing measurable outcomes
 - Designing strategies that address school readiness
 - Plans reflect individual needs of each community
 - Examples
 - Ojai Valley
 - Oxnard NFL
 - Conejo Valley
 - Migrant Families
 - Estimated 14,000 migrant children in Ventura County schools
 - 56% school drop out rate
 - Concentrated effort to engage this population in NFL
 - Access community information through their traditional media sources

- Mental and oral health services and programs
 - Committed significant dollars to address mental health needs in Ventura County
 - \$500,000 to oral health and \$445,000 to mental health
 - Need based
 - Prevention and early intervention in mental health
 - Mobile dental van
 - Treatment and prevention services to pregnant women, mothers and their children within a target population.
 - Childhood and health education program
- Dave Kears, Alameda County, spoke next. An outline follows.
 - Three major strategies for determining State Commission investment
 - Not just more of the same with available funds
 - Leveraging dollars
 - Future directions
 - Connect with other partners to provide services for children after 5 years of age
 - Commission can create models for the future

Mr. Kears urged the State and County Commissions to reach out of the box and spend in different ways, and look to others to help reform the system, or it will never change. He stated that there is a real opportunity to make significant changes if we work together.

- Mike Ruane spoke next. An outline follows.
 - County Funding Priorities
 - Developed in response to State Commission request for the highest priority items for funding, includes:
 - Continuing investments
 - New initiatives
 - Continue investments in capacity and infrastructure statewide
 - New solutions and recommendations each in range of \$5-10 million annually, unless otherwise noted
 - Endorsed by CCAFA membership recognizing local, regional, and statewide considerations
 - Continued investments
 - Proposition 10 is still very young – Our success in sustainable systems change depends most on how we build infrastructure and capacity today
 - Continue investments in rural infrastructure and capacity, including administration, travel, minimum allocations, and

- expansion of School Readiness statewide
 - Continue improvements in technical assistance to counties, emphasizing the need for continuing partnership and coordination between CCFC and CCAFA through the joint CCFC-CCAFA TA Work Group
- Family Support
 - Support families and communities to provide accessible resources for basic family support
 - Contribute to joint foundation/public effort to leverage family support services, including but not limited to, family resource center, as a platform for services (full request amount of \$10 million)
 - Support statewide capacity building for local commission sponsored family support initiative as a major component of local and State-funded school readiness programs
- Family Support Principles
 - All efforts in developing family support networks at the local community level must involve funding of program that demonstrate the following principles:
 - Child and Family Centered
 - Cultural Proficiency
 - Results-Based Accountability
 - Asset-Based/Family Strengths Focus
 - Comprehensive Integrated Services
 - Prevention and Early Intervention
 - Community Driven
- Regional Issues
 - Restructure Migrant Farm Workers
 - Restructure statewide project initiative through existing Central Valley Project pilot
 - Develop and fund replicable model which can be implemented statewide (\$5 - \$8 million)
 - Support continued planning funds for initiative contingent on leveraged resources and transition to statewide model
- Research
 - Evaluate how Proposition 10 home visitation strategies are being linked with related investments (\$250,000)
 - Develop Statewide Tracking of Substance Exposed Births (\$2 million)
 - Review local strategies and best practices regarding immunization registries and support deployment (\$500,000)
 - Fund strategies to support use of GIS mapping in gap analysis and service planning and link to census data (\$500,000)

- Recognize importance of regional approaches to research and coordinating with county research projects (\$5 million)
- Infrastructure Support
 - Support infrastructure for statewide implementation of 2-1-1 (\$5 million)
 - Ensure equal access throughout the State to create a single point of entry referral to family support networks and all children and family serving community organizations
 - Build upon local capacity and create a consistent “family friendly” framework for 2-1-1 statewide
 - Do not fund stand-alone redundant systems
 - Support statewide implementation of partnership with GO-SERV, i.e., AmeriCorps Initiative (\$350,000)
 - Encourage the development of public/private partnerships to increase employer supported early care and education and family friendly policies
 - Revenue Forecasting Model
 - State budget situation necessitates need for sound, credible financial information
 - Continue to prioritize development of reliable revenue forecast model (minimal dollar impact)
 - Release forecasting information on regular schedule to all local commissions for effective planning
- Children’s Health Panel
 - Adopt Healthy People 2010 Objectives for Children’s Health
 - Provide alternative funding mechanisms that are inclusive of all counties
 - Continue to fund child asthma as an awareness and education issue
 - Provider and caregiver training is a critical component of all initiatives
 - Mental Health Strategies (\$5 million)
 - Increase availability of prevention services to infants and young children at risk of developing serious emotional or behavioral disturbances, including prevention; in addition, increase services for postpartum depression
 - Increase public and provider awareness of developmental milestones and local resources
 - Increase provider capacity to diagnose and ensure mental health services for young children.
 - Extend services to preschool setting to include provider training and support for children with special needs.
 - Invest in service system strategies not covered by existing sources, i.e., CCS, EPSDT, Medi-Cal

- Oral Health (\$2 million)
 - Develop statewide education and prevention agenda promoting community awareness
 - Focus on education, prevention, and treatment services (listed in priority order)
 - Leverage and reserve local resources for prevention and treatment services
 - Incorporate oral health services in local and state School Readiness Initiatives
- Informal Care
 - Promote strategies to increase outreach and identification of family and exempt providers
 - Include informal care providers in all state funding strategies (no dollar impact)
 - Set-aside \$5 - \$10 million for program implementation, pending results of a collaborative planning process to target best programs for this initiative
- Implementing Strategies
 - Address Program Implementation Requirements
 - Ongoing need to consider evaluation and start-up costs in any new State Commission initiative
 - Establish Effective State/County Partnership on New Initiatives
 - The Association and County Commissions are willing to work in partnership with the State Commission in the formulation and development of any of the proposed initiatives
 - The Association will designate a County Commission contact/lead person(s) for any new initiative to ensure local coordination and responsiveness

Mr. Ruane also recommended that the State Commission continue to fund children's asthma programs as an awareness and education issue.

Pat Wheatley, President of the CCAFA and Executive Director of the Santa Barbara County Children and Families Commission, wrapped up this panel discussion and assured the State Commission that the County Commissions will be building on this effort and these recommendations. She spoke of the need to focus on implementation and evaluation. CCAFA will designate lead people from the counties to communicate with the State for a real partnership.

Discussion: Chairman Reiner asked for suggestions on improving the mechanism by which the county and State Commissions communicate with each other. It was suggested that there be organized dialogues between groups of local and state commissioners. It was clarified that it would most likely be staff representing the State Commission in the aforementioned dialogue.

Chairman Reiner stated that he would like to see an advocacy group developed and asked for suggestions on how this goal might be achieved.

Commissioner Vismara asked if child 'labeling' is an issue in school readiness. Panelists informed the Commission that some services with eligibility requirements set up conditions of labeling.

Commissioner Belshé asked that the county priorities be identified. The panelists informed the Commission that one way to prioritize is by time sensitivity, i.e., if it's not done now, it will be too late. The Migrant Farm Worker project, AmeriCorps project, family support services, asthma initiative, oral health, and the 2-1-1 project were identified as priorities in that order.

Commissioner Hill-Scott expressed concern that the local commissions are not being adequately represented by the Association. Commissioner Hill-Scott requested that a mechanism be developed to adequately address this concern. The panelists informed the Commission that the Association does adequately represent the local commissions and the point made earlier was that there was more political power available at the local level through county commissioners that is not being utilized. A protocol is currently being developed for formalizing representation of all 58 county commissions.

Commissioner Hill-Scott expressed concern over that fact that there are substantial dollars sitting in county commissions that are not designated for a specific project. The panelists informed the Commission that local commissions need that money to leverage local support in the counties. Some departments have expressed reluctance to be involved if the local commission cannot show sustainability. Commissioner Hill-Scott asked about the unencumbered dollars at the county level. The panelists informed the commission that the annual report from which this question stems contains figures that were accurate as of June 30th (last fiscal year). The Association stated that this item will be agendaized for further discussion.

Commissioner Gutierrez asked what policy decisions have taken place at the local level that prioritize the highest need communities in the county as the areas of focus for Proposition 10. Panelists informed the Commission that analyses have been done on particular needs in general and from these analyses it is found that there are geographical locations with higher needs. San Diego County looks at specific issues rather than specific populations.

Commissioner Gutierrez asked what role the media campaign has played at the local level. The panelists informed that Commission it is a useful tool for advocacy.

Agenda Item 6 – Investments to Create Positive Outcomes for Children with Disabilities and Other Special Needs

- Dr. Tony Appalone, Sonoma State University, presented his findings on research related to children with disabilities and other special needs. Dr. Appalone briefly presented the research methodology. Dr. Marci Hanson summarized the five recommendations coming from this research. Also presenting were Linda Blong, Gloria Levia, Whitcomb Hayslip and Linda Strom. An outline follows.
 - Key Issues
 - Civil Rights
 - Prevention of Negative Impact and Costly Interventions
 - Information and Awareness
 - Unidentified and Unserved Children
 - Coordination and Integration of Services
 - Overview of Recommendations
 - Implement early childhood inclusion resource teams developed through county commissions.
 - Support family centers to enable families of children with disabilities or other special needs to support school readiness.
 - Develop and implement a statewide leadership and disability resources network to share successful models and practices.
 - Develop and implement a countywide, community-based, early screening and identification program.
 - Implement public awareness and education activities that address issues related to children with disabilities and other special needs.

- Option One
 - 12 Comprehensive model demos
 - Inclusion resource team plus family center plus early screening and identification
 - 50% county match
 - 12 Single-Component demos
 - Inclusion resource team or family center or early screening and identification
 - 100% county match
- Option Two
 - 12 Integrated Model Demos
 - Inclusion Resource Team plus family center
 - 50% county match
 - Early steps for statewide screening
 - County level service mapping plus identification of service gaps plus planning to fill gaps plus action to coordinate existing services
- Implementation Approach
 - Support model demonstration projects and phased-in approaches integrating three recommendations:
 - Inclusion resource teams
 - Family centers
 - Early screening and assessment
 - Implement the Leadership Disability Resources Network through an RFP process to ensure linkage, support, and dissemination of all activities. Integrate continuous improvement
 - Integrate issues related to children with disabilities into all aspects of CCFC supported public awareness/education. Designate a minimum of 11.8% of public awareness/education funds. Consider diverting funds to the CBO program.
- Recommendation One
 - Implement early childhood inclusion resource teams developed through county commissions
 - Connecting families and service providers to community resources
 - Coaching and support tailored to individual needs
 - Training and site-to-site mentoring to build capacity
- Recommendation Two
 - Support family centers to enable families of children with disabilities and other special needs to support school readiness
 - Providing information, training and parent-to-parent support for families

- Encouraging family leadership and participation in governance
 - Working collaboratively with Inclusion Resource Teams
- Recommendation Three
 - Develop and implement a statewide leadership and disability resources network to share successful models and practices
 - Linking model sites for inclusion resource teams to support continuous improvement and leadership
 - Building upon existing training and technical assistance systems
 - Broadly disseminating proven and promising practices and models
- Recommendation Four
 - Develop and implement a countywide, community-based, early screening and identification program
 - Coordinating and integrating existing efforts
 - Building a county-wide system for screening all children
 - Supporting continuous monitoring and appropriate referrals that avoid unnecessary labeling
 - Linking with School Readiness and CBO public education initiatives
- Recommendation Five
 - Implementation public awareness and education activities that address issues related to children with disabilities and other special needs
 - Reaching a broad audience through public awareness campaign
 - Targeting families and providers through CBO Public Education and School Readiness initiatives
 - Linking to medical and social service providers networks

Gloria Levia shared a very moving anecdotal experience she went through with her disabled child, Angie, who has cerebral palsy, and the positive effects of her inclusion.

Whit Hayslip spoke about his own experiences in this field. Mr. Hayslip spoke in favor of the above recommendations. He recommended that the State Commission tie these to the school readiness system.

Linda Strom spoke about some of the projects in her district. Ms. Strom spoke in favor of the above recommendations.

Discussion:

Commissioner Vismara stated that Sacramento County has used AmeriCorps resources in the prevention of child abuse. Sheila Anderson is the Executive Director. Commissioner Vismara stated that the Governor's Office has a Department of Volunteerism.

Commissioner Gutierrez asked for details on the February conference on diversity. Vonnie Madigan, of the Center for Health Improvement, informed the Commission that the conference will include 3 counties and will cover pragmatic issues related to diversity in terms of school readiness.

Chairman Reiner asked how much some of the recommendations would cost. Tony Appalone informed the Commission that the statewide resource network would cost \$4-5 million per year. For the model demo programs, for a district the size of Elk Grove it would cost \$1-1.5 million per site. The screening program study would cost roughly \$100,000 per county depending upon size.

Chairman Reiner asked if there were enough inclusion specialists available to meet the current need. The panel stated that there is a need for more inclusion specialists and it should have been included in the recommendations.

Commissioner Hill-Scott stated some of her inferences for the sake of clarity. The resource network is designed to provide information on a statewide level to people in this field. Through the demonstration projects, if conducted and evaluated properly, a profile of the types of expertise and other attributes that an individual would need in order to be an effective specialist would be developed.

Commissioner Vismara emphasized the need to change not only people, but the systems of which those people are a part.

Commissioner Belshé asked to what extent the absence of community resources is a barrier. The panel informed the Commission that the answer to that question is still unknown.

Commissioner Gutierrez stated that the network should be funded by the State Commission in its entirety with county matching funds for some of the demo projects.

Jane Henderson stated that staff has received a variety of recommendations on assessments and screening. The panel informed the Commission that they recommend developing a comprehensive approach. Ms. Henderson asked if there was consideration of expertise in the mental health arena with respect to inclusion specialists. The panel informed the Commission that connections to these services was more likely than each

specialist having this type of training, but many specialists will and do have this type of training.

Commissioner Belshé asked why the Commission should make this area a high priority for a State responsibility. The panel stated that the Commission will be a centering or binding mechanism. Commissioner Vismara added that leadership, passion and knowledge can be provided by the Commission.

Agenda Item 7 – Survey of the General Public, Parents, and Opinion Leaders on Early Care and Development

- Mark DiCamillo and Neal Halfon presented this item. Much of the presentation was in the form of graphs and charts. These data are not presented here. An outline of the presentation follows.
 - Introduction
 - Influence of early childhood experience on later learning and functioning
 - Role for child care and early education
 - Amount of time that children spend in non-parental care
 - Child care and early education as Proposition 10 *Results to Be Achieved*
 - State Master Plan for Education
 - Survey Objectives
 - What do parents view as important in early childhood care arrangements?
 - What are the prevalent arrangements, and unmet needs?
 - How do parents, general public and opinion leaders view child care and early education as policy priorities?
 - What strategies and policies do they support?
 - What is the need for education and social marketing?
 - What are public opinion leader views, and what actions might they take?
 - Population Surveyed
 - Field Research Corporation surveyed three different populations in California as part of the Public Opinion Surveys for the Commission:
 - (1) A random sample of California adults age 18 or older, referred to here as the “General Public Survey,”
 - (2) A random sample of California parents, typically the mother, of children under age 6, referred to here as the “Parent Survey;” and

- (3) A targeted sample of state and local government, business, labor, media, community and religious leaders, referred to here as the “Opinion Leader Survey.”
 - All interviewing was completed between the period September 14 – December 26, 2001.
- Survey Methodology – General Public Survey and Parents Survey
 - Interviews completed by telephone in six languages – English, Spanish, Mandarin, Cantonese, Korean and Vietnamese.
 - Sample sizes: General Public Survey n = 2,018; Parent Survey n = 4,801
 - Each sample stratified across 9 Commission-defined regions of the state and across the states 5 major racial/ethnic groups, so results could be compared by region and by race/ethnicity.
 - After interviewing, results were weighted to align each sample to census-established population parameters and to adjust for any inequalities in the probability of the selection of households.
 - Up to 8 attempts made within each randomly selected household. For general public survey, one adult selected using “next birthday” selections procedure. For parent survey, interview completed with child’s mother, unless mother not in same residence.
 - Sampling error of general public survey +/- 2.2 % at the 95% confidence level; for parent survey sampling error +/- 1.4%
- Presentation Overview
 - Parenting activities and challenges
 - Current child care arrangements for children 0-5
 - Current experiences with child care
 - Parent beliefs and view on child care and early childhood education
 - Comparison of parent, public, and opinion leader views
 - Priorities and strategies
 - Highlights and key points
- Summary of Survey Highlights
 - Child rearing
 - Parents of young children are engaged in a range of developmentally supportive behaviors – but frequency of reading is less than recommended, and varies significantly by the education level of the parent.
 - A significant proportion of parents (26%) of children 0-5 say that the child’s capacity to learn is fixed at birth, with a strong belief gradient by race/ethnicity, and

- education.
- Parents who are working report being exhausted – while the direct impact on productivity was not measured, the implications are clear.
- Parents with children with special health needs report greater challenges
- Experiences with child care
 - About 40% of children 0-5 years are solely cared for by parents in the home.
 - A substantial proportion of parents, the public, and opinion leaders don't compare care provided by child care programs favorably to care provided by the family/extended family.
 - Parents report relatively high satisfaction with child care.
 - Very few parents report receiving child care subsidies, or employer support.
- Future Questions
 - What accounts for the differences in satisfaction?
 - How do parents of different race/ethnicity make choices about child care?
 - What do parents believe about early child care and education?
 - How does use, satisfaction, and concerns differ across regions of California?
 - How does the engagement in other child development parenting behaviors influence selection of child care and satisfaction with care?
 - What are some other issues that working parents face, and how does that influence their choices?
 - How do we reconcile the findings from many studies that home care is usually of lower quality, with the fact that many parents use this arrangement and report general satisfaction?
 - How does receipt of government subsidies influence selection, satisfaction, and views on policy alternatives?
 - What subgroups are most resistant to, and most supportive of, different policy options?
 - How does the support for different policy options vary across regions and by type of care?
 - What are the implications for public education around increasing regional support for particular child care and early education enhancement policies?

Discussion: Chairman Reiner asked how it can be that parents feel on the one hand that they have an impact on the child's ability to learn and on the other hand believe that the child's learning capacity is fixed at birth. The panel informed the Commission that belief that a child's learning capacity is fixed at birth had been decreasing over time. There are three basic frames people have about brain development. One frame is the predetermination frame. Everything is predetermined at birth by God. It is a cultural and cognitive belief system. The second frame is a maturational system. The difference between a maturational system and a developmental system is important to note. In a maturational frame the belief is that the genome unfolds and matures over time. The developmental framework is more about preparing the child for the next steps rather than waiting for them to mature into the position.

Commissioner Hill-Scott stated that a fourth frame is the maximal stretch on elasticity of brain development.

Commissioner Vismara asked the panel if, from a parents perspective, a difference exists between child development and child learning. The panel informed the Commission that there is a perceived difference.

Chairman Reiner stressed the need for policy makers to understand what it is that needs to be done. Chairman Reiner stated that this should be kept in mind as the data are being analyzed.

Commissioner Vismara cautioned against presenting the idea, or developing a public perception, that the Commission is trying to create smarter kids.

The panel asked for guidance in the development of the report. Commissioner Hill-Scott stated that a phone conference should be held to discuss these data further.

Commissioner Belshé spoke about how these data can be used to inform public education and outreach efforts.

Public Comment: Rafael Lopez, Santa Cruz County Children and Families Commission, stated that this data is an important tool for local counties in engaging their communities in discussions of school readiness and other topics. Mr. Lopez stated that if the data were broken down by immigration status, there would be large differences between populations regarding opinions on early care

and education. Mr. Lopez suggested the final report include this analysis. The data should also be broken down for local community members.

Agenda Item 8 – School Readiness Component of the Legislature’s Master Plan for Education (Pre-K through University)

Commissioner Hill-Scott presented this item. The working group on school readiness has met in the past 13 months to design a comprehensive Master Plan for Education for the State of California. The working group has come up with 13 broad recommendations with sub-recommendations. The executive summary is being written now. The main recommendations of the report follow. It is recommended:

- Universal preschool be available on a voluntary basis for all children in the State of California that are 3 and 4 years old.
- Creation of a professional development system.
- Forty-eight hours of paid pre-service training for anyone who cares for a child in early care and education in the State of California that receives subsidies.
- Guaranteeing child care for all children from 0-3 who are income eligible by the year 2010.
- Elimination of the silos and consolidation of categorical funds into a general child development fund for income eligible children.
- Mandatory developmental screenings four times in a child’s life before the age of 5 years, the data from which will go into a state database.
- Dual language learning with English being one of the two languages.
- Devolved governance of early care and education to the county level and restructuring of the California Department of Education.
- Development of a statewide network of school readiness centers that might be part of family resource centers.
- The development of an accountability system, which evaluates program outcomes as well as child outcomes;
- a health care home for all children.

Discussion:

Commissioner Vismara stated that there are potential funding sources for universal health care for children available, but the problem is the identification and linkage to these sources of funding. Commissioner Hill-Scott stated that supports the recommendation on consolidation.

Chairman Reiner asked about Governance and how it relates to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Commissioner Hill-Scott stated that the Work Group recommends the Superintendent of Public Instruction become an appointed position. The School Readiness Working Group recommended a direct line of accountability to the Governor. The head of education would oversee an agency that has two large divisions: 1) preschool to third grade, and 2) fourth grade to grade 12. The resources go through the California Department of Education, but are immediately deployed to the County Office of Education. Chairman Reiner asked if there would be competition between the divisions. Commissioner Hill-Scott stated that there would not be competition. Commissioner Gutierrez asked how much this would cost. Jane Henderson stated that it has not been assessed.

Commissioner Vismara asked if there would be any disqualifications for children enrolled in the pre through third grade program. Commissioner Hill-Scott stated that there would not be disqualifications for services.

Public Comment: Donita Stromgren, California Childcare Resource and Referral Network, indicated that she has concerns for community-based organizations. Ms. Stromgren asked for a timeline on the Master Plan's release. Ms. Henderson stated that there will be several public hearings over the next month. Each one of the committees will be presenting at a public hearing. The School Readiness Work Group's will be presented March 6, 2002. This will be followed by statewide public comment. The goal is to have the complete Master Plan submitted by August 2002. All of that information will be posted on the Joint Committee's website as soon as all of the reports have been received. Commissioner Gutierrez inferred that inclusion resource teams would partner with community organizations that would then be providing the services.

Neal Halfon encouraged the Commission to consider how it could be leveraging major institutions in California that it is not leveraging presently. The health care sector, the managed care sector, and the business sector should also be leveraged. Dr. Halfon strongly recommended against more research and demonstration projects as the answer. There are more effective change strategies. They are based on quality improvement and strategies for rapid change. They are more inclusive.

Commissioner Hill-Scott stated that the research and development being considered does not have to be done in the same way that it has been done. Commissioner Vismara pointed out that the Mind Institute has received considerable funding and continues to do so. Mr. Halfon stated that it not a matter of funds flowing in, but rather leveraging the system to rethink its roles and responsibilities in these matters.

Joyce Hansen, Orange County Children and Families Commission, commented on local commissioner input. Ms. Hansen informed the Commission that there has been a recommendation to form a delegate assembly where each commission could appoint someone to act as their representative. There are working models available. Ms. Hansen supported the inclusion of a mental health component.

Susan Wilson, Siskiyou County Children and Families Commission, expressed concerns about the Commission's knowledge of what regional centers really do. Ms. Wilson supported the inclusion of a mental health component.

Commissioner Hill-Scott stated that the Commission supported the development of a master plan for school readiness. Once it goes to the Joint Legislative Committee, the Commission has no control over what they take and incorporate into California's Master Plan for Education.

Agenda Item 9 – Closed Session (held during lunch break)

Planning Session

Agenda Item 10, 11, 12 – Purpose, Context, and Overview of Planning Session

The Commission convened its planning session by reviewing the purpose and context of a one to three year plan for future investments, beginning fiscal year 2002-03.

Jane Henderson made opening remarks and introduced Cecilia Sandoval. Ms. Sandoval was the facilitator for the session. Ms. Henderson identified 4 goals to be achieved by the Commission during the session: 1.) To begin to identify the potential investments for the coming year and beyond in support of the Commission's goals. 2.) To agree that the potential investments provide adequate focus and meet some criteria for funding that have been developed. 3.) To begin to discuss potential future directions for media and public engagement campaigns. 4.) To provide direction for staff for funding options for

the development of a work plan and a budget.

Ms. Sandoval presented ideas to the Commission on how to proceed in the session. Ms. Sandoval identified her duties as 1) be responsible for how the Commission does the work; 2) keep track of time; 3) keep the Commission on task; and 4) remain content neutral. The ground rules included (1) be as open as possible; (2) to speak to the point under discussion and avoiding tangents; (3) be brief and not repeat; (4) allow people to make their point without interrupting; (5) active listening; (6) agree to disagree; and (7) make decisions by consensus as often as possible.

Jane Henderson framed the discussion and presented some common vocabulary.

- Results areas
 - Improved child health
 - Improved family functioning
 - Parenting education
 - Child abuse prevention
 - Improved child development
 - Prenatal care
 - Oral health
 - Environmental health
 - Child care facilities
 - Education and training for providers
 - Increased access to high quality programs
- Strategies or projects
 - Child care facilities
 - Establish a low cost loan program
 - Directly fund facilities in underserved areas
 - Mental health
 - Expanding the Department of Mental Health's Infant Mental Health pilot program
 - Support training programs for assessment and treatment of young children
 - Education and training of child care providers
 - Expand the current PACE training program
 - Provide additional matching funds to county commissions

Jane Henderson talked briefly about the Sure Start Program. It is a program in England similar to Proposition 10. Ms. Henderson's point was to demonstrate the efficacy of honing in on one or two focus areas for the School Readiness Initiative.

A discussion followed on the mechanics of the session and some of the strategies that may be employed in the following day's session. The discussion yielded the following:

- May examine the efficacy of existing programs. Not sufficient data in most cases to evaluate formally, but can be assessed to some degree.
- Focus high impact versus low impact, high effort versus low effort. High impact would be a systemic change.

Joe Munso presented fiscal information available as background for the planning discussion, including a chart displaying the broad categories in which the Commission's funds are currently invested. A second chart showed the trend for a clear tobacco tax revenue decline over the next four years, as much as 7% per year, based on what can be seen to have occurred over the last few years. For planning purposes, it was estimated that there could be about \$105 million available to invest over the next three years, assuming continued funding of current investments.

The final premise for the retreat is to identify a reasonable array of projects that the Commission wants to invest dollars in during the next 1-3 years. The starting point for this discussion is School Readiness. The recommended framework set forth for looking at potential future investments included the following areas:

- Relationships to the Commission's School Readiness focus
- Reasonable expectation for change
- Communication power
- Data power
- Impact
- Multiplier effect
- No clear existing state responsibility for a high need
- Using incentive/partner strategies, particularly with county commission investments

Commissioners were then asked to prioritize, based on the agreed-on criteria, projects for the next 2-3 years.

Agenda Item 13 – Adjournment of Day One

Action by Commission: The motion to approve was seconded and passed by vote without dissent.

Friday, February 15, 2002 – Day Two of Planning Session – Four Seasons Room

Agenda Item 1 -- Call to Order.

- The meeting was called to order by Chair Reiner at 9:00 a.m.

Agenda Item 2 -- Roll Call.

Present: Commissioners Kim Belshé, Elizabeth Rice-Grossman, Louis Vismara, Karen Hill-Scott, Sandra Gutierrez, and Chairman Rob Reiner. Absent: Ex-officio members Theresa Garcia and Glen Rosselli.

Agenda Item 3 – Open Day Two of Planning Session

Cecilia Sandoval made opening remarks and presented ground rules for the day's discussion.

A discussion on how the Commission views its role vis-à-vis other state agencies yielded the following points:

- Test new ideas.
- Incentivize change.
- Lead to issues, e.g., public education campaign.
- Support existing state infrastructure.
 - Building capacity, not funding existing state programs
- Provide expertise to existing agencies, both state and federal.
 - Should be tiered because it is not a primary role of the Commission.
- Convene new partners, e.g., law enforcement partners, entertainment industry.

Agenda Item 4 – Future Investment Opportunities

Commissioners were asked to write on a chart their priorities for State Commission report, and to vote their agreement on priorities written down by their colleagues.

The following focus areas were identified in a brain storming session:

- Pre-Service Provider Training
- System Building of Providers and Caregivers
- Accountability
- Substance Abuse
- Domestic Violence

- Tobacco Cessation
- Developmental Assessments Reporting
- Informal Caregiver – Support, Training, etc.
- Children of Migrant Farm Families
- Oral Health
- Children/Families w/Disabilities & Special Needs
- Mental Health
- Universal Access to Pre-School
- Access to Childcare
- Immunization Registry
- Prenatal Care

Commissioner Hill-Scott strongly recommended the development of a database registering all services obtained by children. It was decided to keep this point of discussion in the ‘parking lot’, i.e., on hold until later.

From this exercise, and using the other information available to Commissioners, five areas emerged as the top priorities:

- Informal Caregiver Support
- Children of Migrant Farm Worker Families
- Oral Health
- Children/Families with Other Special Needs
- Mental Health

Commissioners then considered again the Commissions role, and spent time discussing how the five relate to one another. Potential strategies were identified within each of these five priority areas.

- Provide matching funds to county commissions
 - Counties work with CBO’s, faith based groups, R&R’s, Regional Occupational centers and child care centers
 - Barriers
 - Provider isolation
 - Provider identification
 - Lack of data
 - Lack of willingness to participate
 - Work with counties to define those needs
 - What should the Commission do to define those needs?
 - Develop models and criteria for local commissions to choose from
 - Set standards

- More research and assessment
- Provider network development
- Incentivize informal care giving
- Community college involvement
 - Could be problematic
 - Not a traditional part of the childcare world
- Parent education
- Formal caregiver support
 - To be addressed later

Children of Migrant Farm Families

- Results
 - Include this population in all focus areas addressed by the Commission
 - Uniqueness of delivery
- ? Healthy children – focus of California Endowment Initiative
 - Improving immunization rates
 - Improving prenatal care
 - Increased access to services
 - Child care
 - Health services
 - Get data on young children
 - Fund research to identify problems
 - Study existing research
 - Most existing data does not focus on very young children
- Partner with local commissions with large migrant populations
 - Fund round tables in the communities
- Fund a summit to bring interested parties together
- Public input sessions

Oral Health

- Results
 - Prevention of oral health disease among young children
 - Provider training and outreach
 - Reimbursement rates
- Strategies
 - Program strategy
 - Early intervention effort in a number of communities

- Integrate oral health services with other services that are being accessed
 - Staff should pursue as a key strategy
 - County commission involvement
 - Drawing down federal dollars
- Education
 - Parent education through media campaign
 - Public outreach
- Examine existing regulation
 - Fluoride varnish

Children and Families with Disabilities and Other Special Needs

- Results
 - Implement a statewide network of experts on the issue of children with disabilities to provide a statewide leadership team to promote successful practices linking model resource teams sharing promising practices and training childcare providers.
 - Explore funding a number of demonstration programs in conjunction with county commissions and in conjunction with the Commission's School Readiness Initiative that would integrate resource teams, family support centers, early screening and assessment and inclusion.

Mental Health

- Results
 - Reduce depression of mothers to promote attachment between mother and child
 - Move toward preventive mental health care
 - Early predictor identification
 - Combine mental health with behavioral health
 - Change access to services
- Strategies
 - Convene a panel of mental health experts to inform and advise the Commission on what its role could be.
 - General versus specific intervention
 - Degrees of illness

- Developmental screening and assessment

Public Comment:

Donita Stromgren, California Childcare Resource and Referral Network, noted that there are different pools of informal care providers. There are nannies with the plan of moving to a more professional caregiver level. There are circumstantial providers, e.g., friends and relatives. There is a very high turnover in circumstantial providers. Ms. Stromgren stressed that training methods should keep that turnover in mind. Ms. Stromgren stated that many child care services already exist for migrant farm workers and should not be overlooked.

Genie Chough, Assistant Secretary, California Health and Human Services Agency, spoke in support of preventive mental health care.

Agenda Item 5 – Closed Session (held during lunch)

Agenda Item 4 – Future Investment Opportunities (Continued)

- Topics to be discussed:
 - CHIS Program
 - efficacy
 - Health Linkages Project
 - Efficacy
 - Asthma Initiative
 - Equity Principles
 - Projects funded prior to passing the principles
 - County minimum funding levels
 - Kit for New Parents
 - Future direction
- CHIS
 - Yet to see final data
 - Large investment for small amount of data
 - CHIS producing a product in the Spring
 - Make informed decision from this product
 - Staff suggests reducing funding if the Commission wants to continue with the project
- Health Linkages
 - Too early to tell how effective it has been
 - Lost a year due to dropping of sponsorship
 - Still in the training stage
 - Staff recommend another \$6.4 million for an additional 2 years
 - \$2.1 million invested to date

- Marcia Sherman stated that there was anecdotal evidence of efficacy at the county level
 - Money has paid for staff and training
 - Could be restructured for matching funds
 - Make the final decision in May
 - Discussion item for April
 - Preliminary report to be presented
- Asthma Initiative
 - Two years is an unrealistically short period of time to have a meaningful evaluation
 - The most common chronic disease in childhood
 - Clear implications for school readiness
 - Opportunities through this investment to leverage approaches to older kids
 - Concerns
 - How it relates to the School Readiness Initiative and Equity Principles
 - Extent to which the screening services are using CHDP as a gateway to comprehensive health insurance coverage
 - Every participating clinic should be certified as an application assistant for healthy families
 - Possible termination of CHDP
- Equity Principles
 - When projects are restructured, the Equity Principles must be considered in the discussion
- County minimum funding level
 - How are the numbers determined
 - \$12 million over 3 years to the counties
 - Administrative support
 - Travel
 - Minimum funding level
 - \$21 million was the outside level
 - Setting a new minimum funding level (\$350,000)
 - \$120,000 per county for school readiness
 - Counties have requested no change in the administrative or travel allotments
 - Cost benefit ratio should be considered in low population counties
 - Options to be presented to the Commission in April
- Kit for New Parents
 - Additional languages to be included
 - Other languages?
 - Develop a plan and timeline
 - Include Diversity Committee input
 - Present to the Commission in April or May

- Production of additional 500,000 guides will require additional funding

Agenda Item 6 – Future Direction of Commission’s Public Engagement Activities

The Commission discussed the direction to take on its media campaign and possible changes in strategy. The Commission has a huge asset in the Kit for New Parents. The results of the policy makers, parents, and public opinion polls were to “get information to parents.” The Commission discussed the need to broaden its constituency and to really build the partnerships necessary to ensure resources and outcomes.

- Definitions of public engagement and public education
 - Public engagement
 - Similar to public education with a focus on constituency building. Engaging the public in the discussion surrounding policy change.
 - Commonality of interest not necessarily agreement
 - Building public will to support a particular project
 - Changing public perceptions
 - Public education
 - Broad effort to raise awareness on one or more issues
- Next phase of the media campaign
 - Increase the distribution of the Kit for New Parents
 - Building advocacy in a way the spotlights the work of Proposition 10
 - Associate various program components to clear community benefits
 - Broaden the constituency
 - Continue smoking cessation
 - Must be done on a large scale and with coordinated efforts
 - Highlight accomplishments
 - School Readiness Center openings
 - To be an ongoing process
 - Adding a layer to the existing campaign, not abandoning the existing message.
 - Changing target audience
 - harder hitting ads
 - Message changing from behavior change to include policy change
 - Cost effectiveness should be emphasized
 - Continue to focus on ongoing educational challenges
 - Should there be further research conducted before expanding
 - It is built into the budget

- Timeline
 - Develop the advocacy concept as the School Readiness Initiative goes out
 - Ads on the air in September
 - The Commission will have ample time to provide input on the development of the campaign

Public Comment:

Roy Behr from GMMB (the Commission's media contractor) made the point that there are many populations that are not aware of the importance of the relationship between early childhood development and positive parent-child interaction.

Agenda Item 7 – Summary and Next Steps

- The Commission agreed on five strategic results areas, all of which would increase support of School Readiness:
 - Informal Caregiver Support
 - Children of Migrant Farm Families
 - Oral Health
 - Children/Families with Other Special Needs
 - Mental Health
- Implementation largely through County Commissions will be most effective strategy, but the Commission will set specific standards and will create incentives.
- More research on informal care providers is needed: who and where are they?
- Children of migrant farm families should be a two-pronged approach: carve out a special area for them in all Commission projects, and focus on improving child care by working with county commissions.
- The Commission will look at integrating its work with other organizations and in conjunction with county commissions.
- Commission staff will find out who is legally authorized to give fluoridation treatments.
- There is a clear need to include children with disabilities and other special needs in all Commission projects and to ensure that the families have the support they need.
- The Commission will fund a number of demonstration projects, perhaps within its School Readiness initiative, including screenings.
- There is a need to obtain more information on mental health to understand the gaps.

- More information will be gathered on strategies and options for the Commission's current investments, including where they fit into the five priority areas identified during this retreat, and those projects will begin to be brought back for discussion in April and May, with a target of making funding decisions in June/July 2002.
- Master Plan issues will be considered.
- The Commission will clarify the results it is seeking via its investments.

Agenda Item 8 – Adjournment

Action by Commission: The motion to adjourn was seconded and passed by vote without dissent at 4:15 p.m.